

Steering Committee Recommendations Summary

PRELIMINARY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

1/18/2001

			Committee Comments
Alternative it is tested in	MAJOR ELEMENTS	2020	

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

1,2,3,4	TDM Package	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>All committee members agree that TDM should be included in the first phase of improvements. Some members noted that the concept needs further elaboration and there needs to be more evaluation of their cost effectiveness before the package is finalized. O</i>
1	Pricing TDM Package	14 YES 1 NO	<i>Committee members support including the pricing TDM package as part of the preferred alternative. Some feel we need to begin to introduce the concept, either through a demonstration project or public education. A few committee members feel that is too c</i>

TRANSIT/HOV

1,2	HCT w/Double transit service within Study Area, transit stations & P&R.		
	Commuter Rail	NO SUPPORT	<i>There was no support for commuter rail, primarily because it offers low ridership for its cost.</i>
	Fixed Guideway	5 YES	<i>A number of members feel that a fixed guideway offers potential for the Translake project prior to 2020, with ties to a BRT/HCT system. Committee members urged careful consideration of how such a system would work with HOV lanes. It was noted that this</i>
	Skip Stop	NO SUPPORT	<i>There was no support for skip stops, primarily because it is seen as unproven for a market of this size. One committee member felt it might be appropriate to consider in the 2030 timeframe. One member recommended that the PPA include an elevated fixed</i>
3	Bus Rapid Transit Service (BRT) w/Double transit service within Study Area, HOV direct access, arterial bus priority treatments, transit stations and P&R.	11 YES	<i>There was significant support for this option as part of 2020 implementation, because of its perceived cost-effectiveness, flexibility, and travel time benefits. It was noted that it will be necessary to ensure sufficient HOV lane capacity or assume dedic</i>
4	Bus Service increase of 50% within Study Area, arterial bus priority treatments, transit stations and P&R.	0 YES	<i>There was no support for this option. Steering Committee members feel that there is not a sufficiently strong rationale to support this investment. One member noted that higher diesel emissions resulting from this alternative would lead to poorer air qua</i>
1,2,3	HOV Express on I-405 with Direct Access Freeway and Arterial Ramps; arterial HOV priority	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>There was strong support for this option as part of 2020 implementation, taking a cost effective environmentally responsible approach. One member pointed out that HOV Express will be necessary to support the BRT infrastructure.</i>

			Committee Comments
Alternative it is tested in	MAJOR ELEMENTS	2020	
ROADWAY			
			<i>Steering Committee members stress that the early action program include three important components—an advanced environmental mitigation strategy, an integrated and phases investment strategy and tools for monitoring and evaluating program elements to ass</i>
	FREEWAY		
1,2,3,4	Basic I-405 Improvements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>All committee members concurred that these should be included as part of 2020 implementation, although one member noted that it will be important to look at the improvements individually in light of each alternative. One members suggested that it will be</i>
2	Add 1 general purpose lane each direction on I-405 with basic I-405 improvements	3 YES	<i>A number of members feel that this option is insufficient to meet future needs. Those members who supported this option, feel that it is not realistic to expect to build one's way out of congestion.</i>
3	Add 2 general purpose lanes each direction on I-405 with basic I-405 improvements and connecting freeway/arterial capacity	12 YES (2 YES AS STATED, & 10 YES PER THE PMT RECOMMENDATION)	<i>A significant majority of Steering Committee members support the PMT's proposed amendments to this alternative, which would add exploration of the HOT lane concept and add only one lane north of 522. Members advised that consideration needs to be given t</i>
4	Add 2 express lanes each direction on I-405 with 1 additional GP lane, basic I-405 improvements and connecting freeway/arterial capacity	NO SUPPORT	<i>There was no support for this option because of its financial and environmental costs and because of its impacts on neighborhoods.</i>
2,3,4	SR 167 / I-405 Interchange Improvements with capacity improvements on SR 167	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>Members supported this option, as part of the first phase of implementation. Members noted that it will be important to avoid wetland impacts and impacts to fish.</i>
2,3,4	Widen SR 167 1 lane each direction to Kent	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>Members supported this option, as part of the first phase of implementation. Members noted that it will be important to avoid wetland impacts and impacts to fish.</i>
4	Widen SR 167 2 lanes each direction to Kent	NO SUPPORT	<i>Members voted to delete this option because of concerns about environmental impacts.</i>
	ARTERIAL		
2,3,4	Implement planned arterial improvements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>All committee members concurred that these should be included as part of 2020 implementation, although one member noted that it will be important to look at the improvements individually in light of each alternative. In addition, it was urged that local</i>
3,4	Expand capacity on north-south arterials	NOT VOTED ON	<i>General support based on written comments received</i>
OTHER ELEMENTS			
	NON-MOTORIZED		
1,2,3,4	Corridor pedestrian and bicycle improvements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>Members supported this option. One member suggested that these improvements should be restricted to making it easy to get across barriers and to access transit safely and conveniently.</i>
1,2,3	Include Long Trails	CONSENSUS ITEM	
	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS)		
1,2,3,4	Corridor Intelligent Transportation System Improvements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>Members supported this option as part of early implementation. One member suggested that a cost-benefit analysis of each improvement be evaluated.</i>
	FREIGHT		
1,2,3	Corridor freight enhancements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>Members supported this option as part of early implementation. One member suggested that a cost-benefit analysis of each improvement be evaluated.</i>